



**ERIC GIBSON**  
INTERIM DIRECTOR

# County of San Diego

## DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND LAND USE

5201 RUFFIN ROAD, SUITE B, SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92123-1666  
INFORMATION (858) 694-2960  
TOLL FREE (800) 411-0017

May 1, 2008

### **CEQA Initial Study - Environmental Checklist Form (Based on the State CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G Rev. 10/04)**

1. Project Number/Environmental Log Number/Title:

L-15206/ER 07-01-004; Elder L-Grade Agricultural Grading Permit

2. Lead agency name and address:

County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use  
5201 Ruffin Road, Suite B,  
San Diego, CA 92123-1666

3. a. Contact: Jarrett Ramaiya, Environmental Planner III  
b. Phone number: (858) 694-3015  
c. E-mail: Jarrett.Ramaiya@sdcounty.ca.gov.

4. Project location:

The proposed project is located at 39693 Calle De Luz Road near the intersection of Jones Road in the Fallbrook Community Plan area of an unincorporated area of the County of San Diego; APN 101-562-07-00.

Thomas Brothers Coordinates: Page 996, Grid H/2

5. Project Applicant name and address:

Wayne and Carol Elders, 40401A De Luz Road, Fallbrook, CA 92028

6. General Plan Designation  
Community Plan:  
Land Use Designation:  
Density:

Pendleton-De Luz  
17 (Estate Residential)  
1 du/0.5 acre

7. Zoning  
Use Regulation: A70 (Limited Agricultural)  
Minimum Lot Size: 2 acres  
Special Area Regulation: None

8. Description of project:

The project is an Agricultural L-grading permit to expand an existing agricultural operation. The project site is located at 39693 Calle De Luz Road in the Fallbrook Community Plan area (Pendleton-De Luz area), within unincorporated San Diego County. The site is subject to the General Plan Regional Category (17) Estate Residential with a Land Use Designation EDA (Estate Development Area). Zoning for the site is A-70 (Limited Agricultural) with a minimum lot size of 2 acres. The project consists of cut and fill of 9,200 cubic yards of soil with no import/export. The site is subject to a Code Enforcement violation for unpermitted grading activities within a 0.6 acre area, and this proposed application is a response to that citation. The site contains an active orchard along with undisturbed vegetation. Access would be provided by an existing unimproved driveway connecting to Calle De Luz Road.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting:

Lands surrounding the project site are used for single family residential and agricultural uses. The topography of the project site and adjacent land is rolling hills with residential and agricultural development. Lands to the north and west are vacant with chaparral vegetation. The site is located within 10 miles of Interstate 5.

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):

Permit Type/Action	Agency
Grading Permit	County of San Diego

**ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:** The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project and involve at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" or a "Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated," as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- |  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Aesthetics</a>                      | <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Agricultural Resources</a>                        | <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Air Quality</a>              |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Biological Resources</a> | <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Cultural Resources</a>                            | <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Geology &amp; Soils</a>      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Hazards &amp; Haz. Materials</a>    | <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Hydrology &amp; Water Quality</a>                 | <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Land Use &amp; Planning</a>  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Mineral Resources</a>               | <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Noise</a>   | <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Population &amp; Housing</a> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Public Services</a>                 | <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Recreation</a>                                    | <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Transportation/Traffic</a>   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Utilities &amp; Service Systems</a> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Mandatory Findings of Significance</a> |   |

**DETERMINATION:**

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- ☐ On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Planning and Land Use finds that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☒ On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Planning and Land Use finds that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Planning and Land Use finds that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jarrett Ramaiya  
Printed Name

\_\_\_\_\_  
May 1, 2008

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Environmental Planner III  
Title

**INSTRUCTIONS ON EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
4. “Potential Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
  - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
  - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
  - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures that were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. The explanation of each issue should identify:
  - a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
  - b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance

**I. AESTHETICS** -- Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact      ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated      ☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** Scenic vistas are singular vantage points that offer unobstructed views of valued viewsheds, including areas designated as official scenic vistas along major highways or County designated visual resources. Based on a review completed by Jarrett Ramaiya on August 9, 2007, the proposed project is not located near or visible from a scenic vista and will not change the composition of an existing scenic vista. The project site is located approximately 10 miles west of Interstate 15 and approximately 10 miles north of Interstate 5. No scenic vistas are within the project area. Therefore, the proposed project will not have any substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.

b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact      ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated      ☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** State scenic highways refer to those highways that are officially designated. A scenic highway is officially designated as a State scenic highway when the local jurisdiction adopts a scenic corridor protection program, applies to the California Department of Transportation for scenic highway approval, and receives notification from Caltrans that the highway has been designated as an official Scenic Highway. Based on a review completed by Jarrett Ramaiya on August 9, 2007, the proposed project is not located near or visible within the same composite viewshed as a State scenic highway and will not change the visual composition of an existing scenic resource within a State scenic highway. Generally, the area defined within a State scenic highway is the land adjacent to and visible from the vehicular right-of-way. The dimension of a scenic highway is usually identified using a motorist's line of vision, but a reasonable boundary is selected when the view extends to the distant horizon. The project site is located approximately 10 miles west of Interstate 15 and approximately 10 miles north of Interstate 5. The project site is not visible from nor to Interstate 15. Therefore, the proposed project will not have any substantial adverse effect on a scenic resource within a State scenic highway.

- c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☒ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** Visual character is the objective composition of the visible landscape within a viewshed. Visual character is based on the organization of the pattern elements line, form, color, and texture. Visual character is commonly discussed in terms of dominance, scale, diversity and continuity. Visual quality is the viewer's perception of the visual environment and varies based on exposure, sensitivity and expectation of the viewers. The existing visual character and quality of the project site and surrounding can be characterized as single family residential and agricultural.

The proposed project is an L-grading plan to permit proposed agriculture (avocado orchard). The project is compatible with the existing visual environment's visual character and quality for the following reasons: The proposed project is for an agricultural use which would compliment the surrounding natural topography which is characterized by rolling hills. Similar agricultural uses are located to the east and south of the project site with single family residences. Lands to the west and north are vacant.

The project will not result in cumulative impacts on visual character or quality because the entire existing viewshed and a list of past, present and future projects within that viewshed were evaluated. Refer to XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered. Those projects listed in Section XVII are located within the viewshed surrounding the project and will not contribute to a cumulative impact for the following reasons: The project proposes an agricultural use as an avocado orchard, which is similar to surrounding uses toward the east and south. Therefore, the project will not result in any adverse project or cumulative level effect on visual character or quality on-site or in the surrounding area.

- d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated ☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project does not propose any outdoor lighting or any building materials with highly reflective properties such as highly reflective glass or high-gloss surface colors. Therefore, the project will not create any new sources of light pollution that could contribute to skyglow, light trespass or glare and that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in area.

**II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES** -- Would the project:

- a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance (Important Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, or other agricultural resources, to non-agricultural use?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** Although the proposed project site does contain agricultural resources (avocado orchard), the site does not contain lands designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. In addition, the proposed project is for on-going agricultural use. Therefore, no agricultural resources including Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance will be converted to a non-agricultural use.

- b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project site is zoned A70 (Limited Agricultural), which is considered to be an agricultural zone. However, the proposed project will not result in a conflict in zoning for agricultural use, because the proposed agricultural use is a permitted use in A70 zones and will not create a conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use. Additionally, the project site's land is not under a Williamson Act Contract. Therefore, there will be no conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract.

- c) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Important Farmland or other agricultural resources, to non-agricultural use?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact      ☒ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated      ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The surrounding area of the project site within a radius of three miles has agricultural uses. As a result, the proposed project was reviewed by Jarrett Ramaiya, Agricultural Specialist, and was determined not to have significant adverse impacts related to the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance or active agricultural operations to a non-agricultural use for the following reasons: Surrounding active agricultural operations consist of avocado and/or citrus orchards which commonly operate among residential uses and create minimal land use conflicts due to the nature of agriculture. Active agricultural operations in the surrounding area are already interspersed with single family residential uses and the proposed use would not significantly change the existing land uses in the area, resulting in a change that could convert agricultural operations to a non-agricultural use. In addition, the proposed project is for continued agricultural use of the property. Therefore, no potentially significant project or cumulative level conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, or Farmland of Local Importance to a non-agricultural use will occur as a result of this project.



**III. AIR QUALITY** -- Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

- a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the San Diego Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) or applicable portions of the State Implementation Plan (SIP)?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact      ☒ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated      ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project proposes development that was anticipated in SANDAG growth projections used in development of the RAQS and SIP. Operation of the project will not result in emissions of significant quantities of criteria pollutants listed in the California Ambient Air Quality Standards or toxic air contaminants as identified by the California Air Resources Board. As such, the proposed project is not expected to conflict with either the RAQS or the SIP. In addition, the project is consistent the SANDAG growth projections used in the RAQS and SIP, therefore, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact.

- b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact      ☒ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated      ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project proposes an avocado orchard. However, grading operations associated with the construction of the project would be subject to County of San Diego Grading Ordinance, which requires the implementation of dust control measures. Emissions from the construction phase would be minimal and localized, resulting in pollutant emissions below the screening-level criteria established by SDAPCD Rule 20.2 and by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) CEQA Air Quality Handbook section 6.2 and 6.3. In addition, the vehicle trips generated from the project will not result in any Average Daily Trips (ADTs). According to the Bay Area Air Quality Management District CEQA Guidelines for Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans, projects that generate less than 2,000 ADT are below the Screening-Level Criteria established by SDAPCD Rule 20.2 and by the SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook section 6.2 and 6.3 for criteria

pollutants. As such, the project will not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.

In general, air quality impacts from land use projects are the result of emissions from motor vehicles, and from short-term construction activities associated with such projects. The San Diego County Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD) has established screening-level criteria for all new source review (NSR) in APCD Rule 20.2. For CEQA purposes, these screening-level criteria can be used as numeric methods to demonstrate that a project's total emissions (e.g. stationary and fugitive emissions, as well as emissions from mobile sources) would not result in a significant impact to air quality. Since APCD does not have screening-level criteria for emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs), the use of the screening level for reactive organic compounds (ROC) from the CEQA Air Quality Handbook for the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB), which has stricter standards for emissions of ROCs/VOCs than San Diego's, is appropriate. However, the eastern portions of the county have atmospheric conditions that are characteristic of the Southeast Desert Air Basin (SEDAB). SEDAB is not classified as an extreme non-attainment area for ozone and therefore has a less restrictive screening-level. Projects located in the eastern portions of the County can use the SEDAB screening-level threshold for VOCs.

- c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** Air quality emissions associated with the project include emissions of PM<sub>10</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub> and VOCs from construction/grading activities, and VOCs as the result of increase of traffic from operations at the facility. However, grading operations associated with the construction of the project would be subject to County of San Diego Grading Ordinance, which requires the implementation of dust control measures. Emissions from the construction phase would be minimal and localized, resulting in PM<sub>10</sub> and VOC emissions below the screening-level criteria established by SDAPCD Rule 20.2 and by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) CEQA air quality handbook section 6.2 and 6.3. The vehicle trips generated from the project will not result in any Average Daily Trips (ADTs). According to the Bay Area Air Quality Management District CEQA Guidelines for Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans, projects that generate less than 2,000 ADT are below the Screening-Level Criteria established by SDAPCD Rule 20.2 and by the SCAQMD CEQA air quality handbook section 6.2 and 6.3 for VOCs and PM<sub>10</sub>.

In addition, a list of past, present and future projects within the surrounding area were evaluated and none of these projects emit significant amounts of criteria pollutants. Refer to XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered. The proposed project as well as the past, present and future projects within the surrounding area, have emissions below the screening-level criteria established by SDAPCD Rule 20.2 and by the SCAQMD CEQA air quality handbook section 6.2 and 6.3, therefore, the construction and operational emissions associated with the proposed project are not expected to create a cumulatively considerable impact nor a considerable net increase of PM<sub>10</sub>, or any O<sub>3</sub> precursors.

San Diego County is presently in non-attainment for the 1-hour concentrations under the California Ambient Air Quality Standard (CAAQS) for Ozone (O<sub>3</sub>). San Diego County is also presently in non-attainment for the annual geometric mean and for the 24-hour concentrations of Particulate Matter less than or equal to 10 microns (PM<sub>10</sub>) under the CAAQS. O<sub>3</sub> is formed when volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>) react in the presence of sunlight. VOC sources include any source that burns fuels (e.g., gasoline, natural gas, wood, oil); solvents; petroleum processing and storage; and pesticides. Sources of PM<sub>10</sub> in both urban and rural areas include: motor vehicles, wood burning stoves and fireplaces, dust from construction, landfills, agriculture, wildfires, brush/waste burning, and industrial sources of windblown dust from open lands.

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** Based a review conducted by Jarrett Ramaiya on August 9, 2007, sensitive receptors have not been identified within a quarter-mile (the radius determined by the SCAQMD in which the dilution of pollutants is typically significant) of the proposed project. Furthermore, no point-source emissions of air pollutants (other than vehicle emissions) are associated with the project. As such, the project will not expose sensitive populations to excessive levels of air pollutants.

Air quality regulators typically define sensitive receptors as schools (Preschool-12<sup>th</sup> Grade), hospitals, resident care facilities, or day-care centers, or other facilities that may house individuals with health conditions that would be adversely impacted by changes in air quality.

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
|---|--|

- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project could produce objectionable odors, which would result from ongoing agricultural uses, volatile organic compounds, ammonia, carbon dioxide, hydrogen sulfide, methane, alcohols, aldehydes, amines, carbonyls, esters, disulfides dust and endotoxins from the implementation and operational phases of the agricultural orchard. However, these substances, if present at all, would only be in trace amounts (less than  $1 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ ). Subsequently, no significant air quality – odor impacts are expected to affect surrounding receptors. Moreover, the affects of objectionable odors are localized to the immediate surrounding area and will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable odor. A list of past, present and future projects within the surrounding area were evaluated and none of these projects create objectionable odors. Refer to XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered.

**IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES** -- Would the project:

- a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☒ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated:** This project is for an agricultural grading permit pursuant to a grading violation of 0.6 acre of granitic southern mixed chaparral. Biological surveys were conducted by Cummings and Associates in September 2007. Prior to the unauthorized grading, the project site contained approximately 6.8 acres of granitic southern mixed chaparral, approximately 2.4 acres of orchards, and approximately 1.3 acres of development. This agricultural permit authorizes the removal of approximate 0.6 acre of granitic southern mixed chaparral that was graded in excess and planted with citrus and avocado trees. In addition, the 2.4 acres of orchards have been historically used for avocados, citrus, and shrubby flower fields from the early 1970s through 2005 as reported by the property owners.

The 0.6 acre of granitic southern mixed chaparral was graded between 2005 and 2006 (located along the western central portion of the property) and potentially served a limited number of sensitive plant, bird, and small mammal species because this portion was relatively small and was surrounded by existing agricultural operations/orchards to the south, northeast, and east. The purchase of off site chaparral within a County-

approved mitigation bank would mitigate for the permanent impacts to habitat and contribute to the preservation of large blocks of habitat that will support the survival and recovery of listed species.

Pursuant to this agricultural grading permit, the 0.6 acre of impact will be mitigated through the purchase of 0.3 acre of chaparral credits located at the Daley Ranch Conservation Bank. The project would mitigate off site through the preservation of large blocks of habitat rather than an on site open space easement of 0.3 acre of chaparral that would be surrounded by agricultural operations to the south, northeast, and east. In addition, the purchase of off-site habitat credits will mitigate for the permanent loss of habitat and contribute to regional habitat preservation.

Therefore, staff has determined that although the site supported 6.8 acres of native biological habitat reduced to 6.2 acres, implementation of the mitigation measure described above will ensure that removal of this habitat will not result in substantial adverse effects, or have a cumulatively considerable impact to species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

- b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                                | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                    |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated:** The site contains one sensitive natural community under the Natural Community Conservation Planning (NCCP) process, granitic southern mixed chaparral. Although the clearing activity reduced the value of this habitat within the local area, the habitat loss will be mitigated through the off purchase of chaparral habitat at a 0.5:1 ratio.

As detailed in response a) above, impacts to sensitive natural communities are considered less than significant through the off site mitigation purchase of 0.3 acre of chaparral.

- c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** Based on a site visit conducted by staff biologist Valerie Walsh on December 6, 2007 and as supported by the Biological Resources Report dated January 4, 2008 and prepared by Cummings and Associates, it has been determined that the proposed project site does not contain any wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, stream, lake, river or water of the U.S. Therefore, no impacts will occur to wetlands defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act in which the Army Corps of Engineers maintains jurisdiction over.

- d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** The northern portion of the project site supports granitic southern mixed chaparral and continues extensively off site to the north and west. The 0.6 acre of granitic southern mixed chaparral that was permanently impacted on site is a portion of habitat that was surrounded by orchards to the south, northeast,

and east. The habitat to the north, northwest, and west is connected to vast areas of vacant and undeveloped land. The grading activity directly impacted 0.6 acre of granitic southern mixed chaparral within the western central portion of the property, that extended into the orchards to the east and south.

In a regional context, the 0.6 acre of granitic southern mixed chaparral habitat on site is within a portion of chaparral situated adjacent to pre-existing agriculture operations (orchards). The 0.6 acre of granitic southern mixed chaparral is not a migratory wildlife corridor because the habitat ends to the south and east in an agricultural and rural residential area within the Pendleton/De Luz region. Therefore, it is not expected that the loss of 0.6 acre of granitic southern mixed chaparral on site and the subsequent purchase of 0.3 acre of chaparral habitat credits would result in the impedance of the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, the use of an established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, and/or the use of native wildlife nursery sites.

- e) Conflict with the provisions of any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan or any other local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

Refer to the attached Ordinance Compliance Checklist dated February 21, 2008, for further information on consistency with any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan, including, Habitat Management Plans (HMP), Special Area Management Plans (SAMP), or any other local policies or ordinances that protect

biological resources including the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP), Biological Mitigation Ordinance, Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO), Habitat Loss Permit (HLP).

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project will not preclude connectivity between areas of high habitat values because the grading of 0.6 acre of chaparral was surrounded by agriculture/orchards to the south, northeast, and east. The habitat loss will not preclude or prevent the preparation of the subregional NCCP because the project site is not located within an approved PAMA or regional linkage. The habitat loss has been minimized and mitigated to the maximum extent practicable in accordance with Section 4.3 of the NCCP Process Guidelines because the off site acquisition of 0.3 acre of chaparral habitat will mitigate for the permanent loss of habitat and contribute to regional habitat preservation at the Daley Ranch Conservation Bank. The habitat loss will not appreciably reduce the likelihood of survival and recovery of listed species in the wild because the granitic southern mixed chaparral habitat that was graded was a relatively small area adjacent to agricultural operations/orchards to the south, northeast, and east. The habitat loss was incidental to otherwise lawful activities. Refer to the attached Ordinance Compliance Checklist dated February 21, 2008 for further information on consistency with any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan, including, Habitat Management Plans (HMP) Special Area Management Plans (SAMP) or any other local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources including the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP), Biological Mitigation Ordinance, Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO), Habitat Loss Permit (HLP).

**V. CULTURAL RESOURCES** -- Would the project:

- a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in 15064.5?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact

☐ Less than Significant Impact

☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated

☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** Based on an analysis of County of San Diego archaeology resource files, archaeological records, maps, and aerial photographs by County of San Diego staff archaeologist, Gail Wright on August 9, 2007, it has been determined that the project site does not contain any historical resources. Therefore, the project would not result in impacts to historical resources.

- b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to 15064.5?



- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

## Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** Based on an analysis of County of San Diego archaeology resource files, archaeological records, maps, and aerial photographs by County of San Diego staff archaeologist, Gail Wright, on August 9, 2007, it has been determined that the project site does not contain any archaeological resources.

## c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique geologic feature?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

## Discussion/Explanation:

**NO IMPACT:** UNIQUE GEOLOGIC FEATURES – THE SITE DOES NOT CONTAIN ANY UNIQUE GEOLOGIC FEATURES THAT HAVE BEEN CATALOGUED WITHIN THE CONSERVATION ELEMENT (PART X) OF THE COUNTY'S GENERAL PLAN (SEE APPENDIX G FOR A LISTING OF UNIQUE GEOLOGICAL FEATURES) OR SUPPORT ANY KNOWN GEOLOGIC CHARACTERISTICS THAT HAVE THE POTENTIAL TO SUPPORT UNIQUE GEOLOGIC FEATURES. ADDITIONALLY, BASED ON A REVIEW BY JARRETT RAMAIYA ON AUGUST 9, 2007, NO KNOWN UNIQUE GEOLOGIC FEATURES WERE IDENTIFIED ON THE PROPERTY OR IN THE IMMEDIATE VICINITY.

## d) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

## Discussion/Explanation:

**NO IMPACT:** A REVIEW OF THE COUNTY'S PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES MAPS INDICATES THAT THE PROJECT IS LOCATED ENTIRELY ON PLUTONIC IGNEOUS ROCK AND HAS NO POTENTIAL FOR PRODUCING FOSSIL REMAINS.

- e) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated ☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** Based on an analysis of County of San Diego archaeology resource files, archaeological records, maps, and aerial photographs by County of San Diego staff archaeologist, Gail Wright, on August 9, 2007, it has been determined that the project will not disturb any human remains because the project site does not include a formal cemetery or any archaeological resources that might contain interred human remains.

**VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS** -- Would the project:

- a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:
- i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?  
Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated ☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project is not located in a fault rupture hazard zone identified by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Special Publication 42, Revised 1997, Fault-Rupture Hazards Zones in California, or located within any other area with substantial evidence of a known fault. Therefore, there will be no impact from the exposure of people or structures to adverse effects from a known hazard zone as a result of this project.

- ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated ☒ No Impact

## Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The Uniform Building Code (UBC) and the California Building Code (CBC) classifies all San Diego County with the highest seismic zone criteria, Zone 4. However, the project is not located within 5 kilometers of the centerline of a known active-fault zone as defined within the Uniform Building Code's Maps of Known Active Fault Near-Source Zones in California. In addition, the project will have to conform to the Seismic Requirements -- Chapter 16 Section 162- *Earthquake Design* as outlined within the California Building Code. Section 162 requires a soils compaction report with proposed foundation recommendations to be approved by a County Structural Engineer before the issuance of a building or grading permit. Therefore, there will be no impact from the exposure of people or structures to potential adverse effects from strong seismic ground shaking as a result of this project.

## iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

## Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The geology of the project site is identified as Cretaceous Plutonic. This geologic environment is not susceptible to ground failure from seismic activity. In addition, the site is not underlain by poor artificial fill or located within a floodplain. Therefore, there will be no impact from the exposure of people to adverse effects from a known area susceptible to ground failure.

## iv. Landslides?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

## Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The site is not located within a landslide susceptibility zone. Also, the staff geologist has determined that the geologic environment of the project area has a low probability to be located within an area of potential or pre-existing conditions that could become unstable in the event of seismic activity.

## b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** According to the Soil Survey of San Diego County, the soils on-site are identified as Cieneba very rocky coarse sandy loam (CmrG) that has a soil erodibility rating of "severe" as indicated by the Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, prepared by the US Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation and Forest Service dated December 1973. However, the project will not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil for the following reasons:

- The project will not result in unprotected erodible soils; will not alter existing drainage patterns; is not located in a floodplain, wetland, or significant drainage feature.
- The project has prepared a Storm Water Management Plan dated March 20, 2008, prepared by Michael L. Benesh, R.C.E. The plan includes the following Best Management Practices to ensure sediment does not erode from the project site: stockpile management, solid waste management, gravel bag berms, material delivery and storage, spill prevention and control, concrete waste management, and any minor slopes created incidental to construction and not subject to a major or minor grading permit shall be protected by covering with plastic or tarp prior to a rain event, and shall have vegetative cover reestablished within 180 days of completion of the slope and prior to final approval.
- The project involves grading. However, the project is required to comply with the San Diego County Code of Regulations, Title 8, Zoning and Land Use Regulations, Division 7, Sections 87.414 (DRAINAGE - EROSION PREVENTION) and 87.417 (PLANTING). Compliance with these regulations minimizes the potential for water and wind erosion.

Due to these factors, it has been found that the project will not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil on a project level.

In addition, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact because all the of past, present and future projects included on the list of projects that involve grading or land disturbance are required to follow the requirements of the San Diego County Code of Regulations, Title 8, Zoning and Land Use Regulations, Division 7, Sections 87.414 (DRAINAGE - EROSION PREVENTION) and 87.417 (PLANTING); Order 2001-01 (NPDES No. CAS 0108758), adopted by the San Diego Region RWQCB on February 21, 2001; County Watershed Protection, Storm Water Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance (WPO) (Ord. No. 9424); and County Storm water Standards Manual adopted on February 20, 2002, and amended January 10, 2003 (Ordinance No. 9426). Refer to XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered.

- c) Will the project produce unstable geological conditions that will result in adverse impacts resulting from landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated ☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project is not located on or near geological formations that are unstable or would potentially become unstable as a result of the project. On a review conducted by Jarrett Ramaiya on August 9, 2007, no geological formations or features were noted that would produce unstable geological conditions as a result of the project. For further information refer to VI Geology and Soils, Question a., i-iv listed above.

- d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated ☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project does not contain expansive soils as defined by Table 18-I-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994). The soils on-site are Cienega very rocky coarse sandy loam (CmrG). These soils have a shrink-swell behavior of low and represent no substantial risks to life or property. Therefore, the project will not create a substantial risk to life or property. This was confirmed by staff review of the Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, prepared by the US Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation and Forest Service dated December 1973.

- e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated ☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project is for an agricultural orchard. The project does not propose any septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems since no wastewater will be generated.

**VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS** -- Would the project:

- a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or wastes?

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                          | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment because it does not propose the storage, use, transport, emission, or disposal of Hazardous Substances, nor are Hazardous Substances proposed or currently in use in the immediate vicinity.

- b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project will not contain, handle, or store any potential sources of chemicals or compounds that would present a significant risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances.

- c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project is not located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. Therefore, the project will not have any effect on an existing or proposed school.

- d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact      ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated      ☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project is not located on a site listed in the State of California Hazardous Waste and Substances sites list compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.

- e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact      ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated      ☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The proposed project is not located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP), a Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP), or within two miles of a public airport. Also, the project does not propose construction of any structure equal to or greater than 150 feet in height, constituting a safety hazard to aircraft and/or operations from an airport or heliport. Therefore, the project will not constitute a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

- f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact      ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated      ☒ No Impact

## Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The proposed project is not within one mile of a private airstrip. As a result, the project will not constitute a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

## Discussion/Explanation:

The following sections summarize the project's consistency with applicable emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans.

i. OPERATIONAL AREA EMERGENCY PLAN:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The Operational Area Emergency Plan is a framework document that provides direction to local jurisdictions to develop specific operational area of San Diego County. It provides guidance for emergency planning and requires subsequent plans to be established by each jurisdiction that has responsibilities in a disaster situation. The project will not interfere with this plan because it will not prohibit subsequent plans from being established.

ii. SAN DIEGO COUNTY NUCLEAR POWER STATION EMERGENCY RESPONSE PLAN

**No Impact:** The San Diego County Nuclear Power Station Emergency Response Plan will not be interfered with by the project due to the location of the project, plant and the specific requirements of the plan. The emergency plan for the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station includes an emergency planning zone within a 10-mile radius. All land area within 10 miles of the plant is not within the jurisdiction of the unincorporated County and as such a project in the unincorporated area is not expected to interfere with any response or evacuation.

iii. OIL SPILL CONTINGENCY ELEMENT

**No Impact:** The Oil Spill Contingency Element will not be interfered with because the project is not located along the coastal zone or coastline.



iv. EMERGENCY WATER CONTINGENCIES ANNEX AND ENERGY SHORTAGE RESPONSE PLAN

**No Impact:** The Emergency Water Contingencies Annex and Energy Shortage Response Plan will not be interfered with because the project does not propose altering major water or energy supply infrastructure, such as the California Aqueduct.

v. DAM EVACUATION PLAN

**No Impact:** The Dam Evacuation Plan will not be interfered with because the project is located outside a dam inundation zone.

- h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☒ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The proposed project is adjacent to wildlands that have the potential to support wildland fires. However, the project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires because the project will comply with the regulations relating to emergency access, water supply, and defensible space specified in the Consolidated Fire Code for the 17 Fire Protection Districts in San Diego County and Appendix II-A, as adopted and amended by the local fire protection district. Implementation of these fire safety standards will occur during the grading permit process and the proposed project would involve irrigated agriculture.

Also, a review by Ed Hayman, Department of Planning and Land Use Fire Marshal on August 9, 2007, the proposed project does not involve habitable space or structures and therefore, does not require additional review. Therefore, based on the review of the project by County staff, through compliance with the Consolidated Fire Code and Appendix II-A and through compliance with the review of the DPLU fire marshal, the project is not anticipated to expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving hazardous wildland fires. Moreover, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact, because all past, present and future projects in the surrounding area are required to comply with the Consolidated Fire Code and Appendix II-A.

- i) Propose a use, or place residents adjacent to an existing or reasonably foreseeable use that would substantially increase current or future resident's exposure to vectors, including mosquitoes, rats or flies, which are capable of transmitting significant public health diseases or nuisances?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

## Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project does not involve or support uses that allow water to stand for a period of 72 hours (3 days) or more (e.g. artificial lakes, agricultural irrigation ponds). Also, the project does not involve or support uses that will produce or collect animal waste, such as equestrian facilities, agricultural operations (chicken coops, dairies etc.), solid waste facility or other similar uses. Moreover, based on a review conducted by Jarrett Ramaiya on August 9, 2007, there are none of these uses on adjacent properties. Therefore, the project will not substantially increase current or future resident's exposure to vectors, including mosquitoes, rats or flies.

**VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY** -- Would the project:

a) Violate any waste discharge requirements?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

## Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project proposes to permit previous grading activities for an agriculture use which requires NPDES permits. The project applicant has provided a copy of a Stormwater Management Plan which demonstrates that the project will comply with all requirements of the RWQCB. The project site proposes and will be required to implement the following site design measures and/or source control BMPs and/or treatment control BMPs to reduce potential pollutants to the maximum extent practicable from entering storm water runoff: stockpile management, solid waste management, gravel bag berms, material delivery and storage, spill prevention and control, concrete waste management, and any minor slopes created incidental to construction and not subject to a major or minor grading permit shall be protected by covering with plastic or tarp prior to a rain event, and shall have vegetative cover reestablished within 180 days of completion of the slope and prior to final approval. These measures will enable the project to meet waste discharge requirements as required by the Land-Use Planning for New Development and Redevelopment Component of the San Diego Municipal Permit (SDRWQCB Order No. 2001-01), as implemented by the San Diego County Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program (JURMP) and Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP).

Finally, the project's conformance to the waste discharge requirements listed above ensures the project will not create cumulatively considerable water quality impacts

related to waste discharge because, through the permit, the project will conform to Countywide watershed standards in the JURMP and SUSMP, derived from State regulation to address human health and water quality concerns. Therefore, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact to water quality from waste discharges.

- b) Is the project tributary to an already impaired water body, as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list? If so, could the project result in an increase in any pollutant for which the water body is already impaired?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☒ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project lies in the De Luz hydrologic subarea, within the 902 (Santa Margarita) hydrologic unit. According to the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list, July 2003, portions of this watershed, including Rainbow Creek and Santa Margarita Lagoon are impaired for eutrophication. Constituents of concern in the Santa Margarita watershed include Nitrate (surface and groundwater), sediment, coliform bacteria, and TDS in groundwater.

The project proposes the following activities that are associated with these pollutants: there will be soil-disturbing activities that will result in exposed soil areas which include minor grading and trenching, there may be stockpiling (soil, compost, asphalt concrete, solid waste) for over 24 hours, there will be temporary on-site storage of construction materials, including mortar mix, raw landscaping and soil stabilization materials, treated lumbar, rebar, and plated metal fencing materials, and there might be trash generated from the project. However, the following site design measures and/or source control BMPs and/or treatment control BMPs will be employed such that potential pollutants will be reduced in any runoff to the maximum extent practicable so as not to increase the level of these pollutants in receiving waters: stockpile management, solid waste management, gravel bag berms, material delivery and storage, spill prevention and control, concrete waste management, and any minor slopes created incidental to construction and not subject to a major or minor grading permit shall be protected by covering with plastic or tarp prior to a rain event, and shall have vegetative cover reestablished within 180 days of completion of the slope and prior to final approval.

The proposed BMPs are consistent with regional surface water and storm water planning and permitting process that has been established to improve the overall water quality in County watersheds. As a result the project will not contribute to a cumulative impact to an already impaired water body, as listed on the Clean Water Act Section

303(d). Regional surface water and storm water permitting regulation for County of San Diego, Incorporated Cities of San Diego County, and San Diego Unified Port District includes the following: Order 2001-01 (NPDES No. CAS 0108758), adopted by the San Diego Region RWQCB on February 21, 2001; County Watershed Protection, Storm Water Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance (WPO) (Ord. No. 9424); County Storm water Standards Manual adopted on February 20, 2002, and amended January 10, 2003 (Ordinance No. 9426). The stated purposes of these ordinances are to protect the health, safety and general welfare of the County of San Diego residents; to protect water resources and to improve water quality; to cause the use of management practices by the County and its citizens that will reduce the adverse effects of polluted runoff discharges on waters of the state; to secure benefits from the use of storm water as a resource; and to ensure the County is compliant with applicable state and federal laws. Ordinance No. 9424 (WPO) has discharge prohibitions, and requirements that vary depending on type of land use activity and location in the County. Ordinance No. 9426 is Appendix A of Ordinance No. 9424 (WPO) and sets out in more detail, by project category, what Dischargers must do to comply with the Ordinance and to receive permits for projects and activities that are subject to the Ordinance. Collectively, these regulations establish standards for projects to follow which intend to improve water quality from headwaters to the deltas of each watershed in the County. Each project subject to WPO is required to prepare a Storm water Management Plan that details a project's pollutant discharge contribution to a given watershed and propose BMPs or design measures to mitigate any impacts that may occur in the watershed.

- c) Could the proposed project cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact      ☒ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated      ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The Regional Water Quality Control Board has designated water quality objectives for waters of the San Diego Region as outlined in Chapter 3 of the Water Quality Control Plan (Plan). The water quality objectives are necessary to protect the existing and potential beneficial uses of each hydrologic unit as described in Chapter 2 of the Plan.

The project lies in the De Luz hydrologic subarea, within the 902 Santa Margarita hydrologic unit that has the following existing and potential beneficial uses for inland surface waters, coastal waters, reservoirs and lakes, and ground water: municipal and domestic supply; agricultural supply; industrial process supply; industrial service supply; groundwater recharge; contact water recreation; non-contact water recreation; warm freshwater habitat; cold freshwater habitat; wildlife habitat; estuarine habitat; marine habitat; migration of aquatic organisms; and, rare, threatened, or endangered species habitat.

The project proposes the following potential sources of polluted runoff: there will be soil-disturbing activities that will result in exposed soil areas which include minor grading and trenching, there may be stockpiling (soil, compost, asphalt concrete, solid waste) for over 24 hours, there will be temporary on-site storage of construction materials, including mortar mix, raw landscaping and soil stabilization materials, treated lumbar, rebar, and plated metal fencing materials, and there might be trash generated from the project. However, the following site design measures and/or source control BMPs and/or treatment control BMPs will be employed to reduce potential pollutants in runoff to the maximum extent practicable, such that the proposed project will not cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses: stockpile management, solid waste management, gravel bag berms, material delivery and storage, spill prevention and control, concrete waste management, and any minor slopes created incidental to construction and not subject to a major or minor grading permit shall be protected by covering with plastic or tarp prior to a rain event, and shall have vegetative cover reestablished within 180 days of completion of the slope and prior to final approval.

In addition, the proposed BMPs are consistent with regional surface water, storm water and groundwater planning and permitting process that has been established to improve the overall water quality in County watersheds. As a result, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses. Refer

to Section VIII., Hydrology and Water Quality, Question b, for more information on regional surface water and storm water planning and permitting process.

- d) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact      ☐ Less than Significant Impact

☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated      ☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project will obtain its water supply from the Fallbrook Public Utility Water District that obtains water from surface reservoirs or other imported water source. The project will not use any groundwater for any purpose, including irrigation, domestic or commercial demands. In addition, the project does not involve operations that would interfere substantially with groundwater recharge including, but not limited to the following: the project does not involve regional diversion of water to another groundwater basin; or diversion or channelization of a stream course or waterway with impervious layers, such as concrete lining or culverts, for substantial distances (e.g. ¼ mile). These activities and operations can substantially affect rates of groundwater recharge. Therefore, no impact to groundwater resources is anticipated.

- e) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact      ☒ Less than Significant Impact

☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated      ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project proposes to permit grading activities for an agricultural orchard. As outlined in the Storm water Management Plan (SWMP) dated March 20, 2008, and prepared by Michael L. Benesh, R.C.E., the project will implement the following site design measures, source control, and/or treatment control BMPs to reduce potential pollutants, including sediment from erosion or siltation, to the maximum extent practicable from entering storm water runoff: stockpile management, solid waste

management, gravel bag berms, material delivery and storage, spill prevention and control, concrete waste management, and any minor slopes created incidental to construction and not subject to a major or minor grading permit shall be protected by covering with plastic or tarp prior to a rain event, and shall have vegetative cover reestablished within 180 days of completion of the slope and prior to final approval. These measures will control erosion and sedimentation and satisfy waste discharge requirements as required by the Land-Use Planning for New Development and Redevelopment Component of the San Diego Municipal Permit (SDRWQCB Order No. 2001-01), as implemented by the San Diego County Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program (JURMP) and Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP). The SWMP specifies and describes the implementation process of all BMPs that will address equipment operation and materials management, prevent the erosion process from occurring, and prevent sedimentation in any onsite and downstream drainage swales. The Department of Public Works will ensure that the Plan is implemented as proposed. Due to these factors, it has been found that the project will not result in significantly increased erosion or sedimentation potential and will not alter any drainage patterns of the site or area on- or off-site. In addition, because erosion and sedimentation will be controlled within the boundaries of the project, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact. For further information on soil erosion refer to VI., Geology and Soils, Question b.

- f) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The proposed project will not significantly alter established drainage patterns or significantly increase the amount of runoff for the following reasons, based on a Drainage Study prepared by Michael Benesh, RCE dated March 20, 2008:

- Drainage will be conveyed to either natural drainage channels or approved drainage facilities.

Therefore, the project will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site. Moreover, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable alteration or a drainage pattern or increase in the rate or amount of runoff, because the project will substantially increase water surface elevation or runoff exiting the site, as detailed above.

g) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☒ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project does not propose to create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems.

h) Provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☒ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project proposes the following potential sources of polluted runoff: there will be soil-disturbing activities that will result in exposed soil areas which include minor grading and trenching, there may be stockpiling (soil, compost, asphalt concrete, solid waste) for over 24 hours, there will be temporary on-site storage of construction materials, including mortar mix, raw landscaping and soil stabilization materials, treated lumbar, rebar, and plated metal fencing materials, and there might be trash generated from the project. However, the following site design measures and/or source control BMPs and/or treatment control BMPs will be employed such that potential pollutants will be reduced in runoff to the maximum extent practicable: stockpile management, solid waste management, gravel bag berms, material delivery and storage, spill prevention and control, concrete waste management, and any minor slopes created incidental to construction and not subject to a major or minor grading permit shall be protected by covering with plastic or tarp prior to a rain event, and shall have vegetative cover reestablished within 180 days of completion of the slope and prior to final approval. Refer to VIII Hydrology and Water Quality Questions a, b, c, for further information.



- i) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map, including County Floodplain Maps?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact      ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated      ☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** No FEMA mapped floodplains or County-mapped floodplains were identified on the project site; therefore, no impact will occur.

- j) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact      ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated      ☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** No 100-year flood hazard areas were identified on the project site; therefore, no impact will occur.

- k) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact      ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated      ☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project site lies outside any identified special flood hazard area including a mapped dam inundation area for a major dam/reservoir within San Diego County. In addition, the project is not located immediately downstream of a minor dam that could potentially flood the property. Therefore, the project will not expose people to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding.

- l) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact      ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated      ☒ No Impact

## Discussion/Explanation:

## i. SEICHE

**No Impact:** The project site is not located along the shoreline of a lake or reservoir; therefore, could not be inundated by a seiche.

## ii. TSUNAMI

**No Impact:** The project site is located more than a mile from the coast; therefore, in the event of a tsunami, would not be inundated.

## iii. MUDFLOW

**No Impact:** Mudflow is type of landslide. The site is not located within a landslide susceptibility zone. The geologic environment of the project area has a low probability to be located within an area of potential or pre-existing conditions that could become unstable in the event of seismic activity. In addition, though the project does propose land disturbance that will expose unprotected soils, the project is not located downstream from unprotected, exposed soils within a landslide susceptibility zone. Therefore, it is not anticipated that the project will expose people or property to inundation due to a mudflow.

**IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING** -- Would the project:

## a) Physically divide an established community?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact      ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated      ☒ No Impact

## Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project does not propose the introducing new infrastructure such major roadways or water supply systems, or utilities to the area. Therefore, the proposed project will not significantly disrupt or divide the established community.

b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

## Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The proposed project is subject to the Regional Land Use Element Policy 1.3 (EDA) Estate Development Area and General Plan Land Use Designation 17 (Estate Residential). The project is consistent with the General Plan because agricultural uses are anticipated by the 17 (Estate Residential) Land Use Designation that provides for minor agricultural and low density residential uses. The project is subject to the policies of the (Pendleton-De Luz) Fallbrook Community Plan. The proposed project is consistent with the policies of the Fallbrook Community Plan. The property is zoned A70 (Limited Agricultural) which permits horticulture, tree crops, row and field crops, packing and processing: limited, and packing and processing: wholesale limited winery, pursuant to The Zoning Ordinance Section 2702; therefore, the proposed project is consistent with plan and zone.

**X. MINERAL RESOURCES** -- Would the project:

- a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

## Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The lands within the project site do not have a Mineral Land Classification from the California Department of Conservation – Division of Mines and Geology (Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego Production-Consumption Region, 1997); but the site is located within an alluvial river valley that has a significant source of replenishment or is underlain by coastal marine/non-marine granular deposits. Staff geologist Jim Bennett has reviewed the site's geologic environment and has determined that this resource is not a significant loss of availability of a known mineral resource of value to the region and the residents of the state for the following reasons: the agricultural use would not affect the potential for any future resource recovery due to no impervious surface or major extraction of soil. Moreover, if the resources are not considered significant mineral deposits, loss of these resources cannot contribute to a potentially significant cumulative impact.

- b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact      ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated      ☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project site is zoned A70 (Limited Agricultural), which is not considered to be an Extractive Use Zone (S-82) nor does it have an Impact Sensitive Land Use Designation (24) with an Extractive Land Use Overlay (25) (County Land Use Element, 2000).

**XI. NOISE** -- Would the project result in:

- a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact      ☒ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated      ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project is to permit grading activities associated with an agricultural use and will be utilized by workers. Based on a review completed by Jarrett Ramaiya on August 9, 2007, the surrounding area supports residential and agricultural uses and is occupied by residents. The project will not expose people to potentially significant noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, and other applicable standards for the following reasons:

General Plan – Noise Element

The County of San Diego General Plan, Noise Element, Policy 4b addresses noise sensitive areas and requires an acoustical study to be prepared for any use that may expose noise sensitive areas to noise in excess of a Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) of 60 decibels (dBA). Moreover, if the project is excess of CNEL 60 dB(A), modifications must be made to the project to reduce noise levels. Noise sensitive areas include residences, hospitals, schools, libraries or similar facilities where quiet is an important attribute. Project implementation is not expected to expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to road, airport, heliport, railroad, industrial or other noise in excess of the CNEL 60 dB(A). This is based on staff's review of projected County noise contour maps (CNEL 60 dB(A) contours) and/or review by County Noise

Specialist Emmet Aquino on August 9, 2007. Therefore, the project will not expose people to potentially significant noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, Noise Element.

**Noise Ordinance – Section 36-404**

Non-transportation noise generated by the project is not expected to exceed the standards of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36-404) at or beyond the project's property line. The site is zoned A70 (Limited Agricultural) that has a one-hour average sound limit of 50 dBA from 7 a.m. to 10 p.m. and 45 dBA from 10 p.m. to 7 a.m. The adjacent properties are zoned A70 and have one-hour average sound limit of 50 dBA from 7 a.m. to 10 p.m. and 45 dBA from 10 p.m. to 7 a.m. Based on review by staff, the project's noise levels are not anticipated to impact adjoining properties or exceed County Noise Standards, which is 50 dBA, because the project does not involve any noise producing equipment that would exceed applicable noise levels at the adjoining property line.

**Noise Ordinance – Section 36-410**

The project will not generate construction noise that may exceed the standards of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36-410). Construction operations will occur only during permitted hours of operation pursuant to Section 36-410. Also, It is not anticipated that the project will operate construction equipment in excess of an average sound level of 75dB between the hours of 7 AM and 7 PM.

Finally, the project's conformance to the County of San Diego General Plan (Noise Element, Policy 4b) and County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36-404 and 36.410) ensures the project will not create cumulatively considerable noise impacts, because the project will not exceed the local noise standards for noise sensitive areas; and the project will not exceed the applicable noise level limits at the property line or construction noise limits, derived from State regulation to address human health and quality of life concerns. Therefore, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable exposure of persons or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan, noise ordinance, and applicable standards of other agencies.

- b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project does not propose any of the following land uses that can be impacted by groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.

1. Buildings where low ambient vibration is essential for interior operation, including research and manufacturing facilities with special vibration constraints.
2. Residences and buildings where people normally sleep including hotels, hospitals, residences and where low ambient vibration is preferred.
3. Civic and institutional land uses including schools, churches, libraries, other institutions, and quiet office where low ambient vibration is preferred.
4. Concert halls for symphonies or other special use facilities where low ambient vibration is preferred.

Also, the project does not propose any major, new or expanded infrastructure such as mass transit, highways or major roadways or intensive extractive industry that could generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels on-site or in the surrounding area.

- c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project involves the following permanent noise sources that may increase the ambient noise level: farm equipment. As indicated in the response listed under Section XI Noise, Question a., the project would not expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas in the vicinity to a substantial permanent increase in noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, and other applicable local, State, and Federal noise control. Also, the project is not expected to expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to noise 10 dB CNEL over existing ambient noise levels based on review of the project by County staff. Studies completed by the Organization of Industry Standards (ISO 362; ISO 1996 1-3; ISO 3095; and ISO 3740-3747) state an increase of 10 dB is perceived as twice as loud and is perceived as a significant increase in the ambient noise level.

The project will not result in cumulatively noise impacts because a list of past, present and future projects within in the vicinity were evaluated. It was determined that the project in combination with a list of past, present and future project would not expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to noise 10 dB CNEL over existing ambient noise levels. Refer to XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered.

- d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact      ☒ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated      ☐ No Impact

## Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project does not involve any uses that may create substantial temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity including but not limited to extractive industry; outdoor commercial or industrial uses that involve crushing, cutting, drilling, grinding, or blasting of raw materials; truck depots, transfer stations or delivery areas; or outdoor sound systems.

Also, general construction noise is not expected to exceed the construction noise limits of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36-410), which are derived from State regulations to address human health and quality of life concerns. Construction operations will occur only during permitted hours of operation pursuant to Section 36-410. Also, it is not anticipated that the project will operate construction equipment in excess of 75 dB for more than an 8 hours during a 24-hour period. Therefore, the project would not result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in existing ambient noise levels in the project vicinity.

- e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact      ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated      ☒ No Impact

## Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The proposed project is not located within a Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) for airports or within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport. Therefore, the project will not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive airport-related noise levels.

- f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact      ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated      ☒ No Impact

Incorporated

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The proposed project is not located within a one-mile vicinity of a private airstrip; therefore, the project will not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive airport-related noise levels.

**XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING** -- Would the project:

- a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact

☐ Less than Significant Impact

☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation  
Incorporated

☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The proposed project will not induce substantial population growth in an area because the project does not propose any physical or regulatory change that would remove a restriction to or encourage population growth in an area including, but limited to the following: new or extended infrastructure or public facilities; new commercial or industrial facilities; large-scale residential development; accelerated conversion of homes to commercial or multi-family use; or regulatory changes including General Plan amendments, specific plan amendments, zone reclassifications, sewer or water annexations; or LAFCO annexation actions.

- b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact

☐ Less than Significant Impact

☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation  
Incorporated

☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The proposed project will not displace any existing housing since the site is currently vacant.

- c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?



- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact      ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated      ☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The proposed project will not displace a substantial number of people since the site is currently vacant.

**XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES**

- a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

- i. Fire protection?
- ii. Police protection?
- iii. Schools?
- iv. Parks?
- v. Other public facilities?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact      ☐ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated      ☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** Based on the information received for the project, the proposed project will not result in the need for significantly altered services or facilities. Existing services are available to the project from the following agencies/district: Fallbrook Public Utility District. The project does not involve the construction of new or physically altered governmental facilities including but not limited to fire protection facilities, sheriff facilities, schools, or parks in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance service ratios or objectives for any public services. Therefore, the project will not have an adverse physical effect on the environment because the project does not require new or significantly altered services or facilities to be constructed.

**XIV. RECREATION**

- a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

## Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project does not propose any residential use, included but not limited to a residential subdivision, mobilehome park, or construction for a single-family residence that may increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities in the vicinity.

- b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

## Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project does not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Therefore, the construction or expansion of recreational facilities cannot have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

**XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC** -- Would the project:

- a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

## Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project does not propose any additional ADTs; therefore, the proposed project will have no impact on the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system.

- b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the County congestion management agency and/or as identified by the County of San Diego Transportation Impact Fee Program for designated roads or highways?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact      ☐ Less than Significant Impact  
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated      ☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project does not propose any additional ADTs; therefore, the proposed project will have no direct or cumulative impact on the level of service standard established by the County congestion management agency for designated roads or highways.

- c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact      ☐ Less than Significant Impact  
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated      ☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The proposed project is located outside of an Airport Influence Area and is not located within two miles of a public or public use airport; therefore, the project will not result in a change in air traffic patterns.

- d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact      ☐ Less than Significant Impact  
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated      ☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The proposed project will not alter traffic patterns, roadway design, place incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) on existing roadways, or create or place curves, slopes or walls which impedes adequate site distance on a road.

- e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

## Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The proposed project will not result in inadequate emergency access. The DPLU Fire Marshal has reviewed the proposed project and has determined that there is adequate emergency fire access. Additionally, roads used to access the proposed project site are up to County standards.

## f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

## Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** No on-site or off-site parking is required or proposed. The proposed project is a grading permit for an agricultural use, which has existing parking areas for vehicles and associated farm equipment. Thus, parking will not result in an insufficient capacity on-site or off-site.

## g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

## Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The proposed project is a grading permit for an agricultural use. The implementation will not result in any construction or new road design features; therefore, will not conflict with policies regarding alternative transportation.

**XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS** -- Would the project:

## a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Incorporated

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project does not involve any uses that will discharge any wastewater to sanitary sewer or on-site wastewater systems (septic). Therefore, the project will not exceed any wastewater treatment requirements.

- b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

<input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project does not include new or expanded water or wastewater treatment facilities. In addition, the project does not require the construction or expansion of water or wastewater treatment facilities. Therefore, the project will not require any construction of new or expanded facilities, which could cause significant environmental effects.

- c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

<input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project does not include new or expanded storm water drainage facilities. Moreover, the project does not involve any landform modification or require any source, treatment or structural Best Management Practices for storm water. Therefore, the project will not require any construction of new or expanded facilities, which could cause significant environmental effects.

- d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

<input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	<input type="checkbox"/> No Impact

## Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project requires water service from the Fallbrook Public Utility District. The Fallbrook Public Utility District has indicated adequate water resources and entitlements are available to serve the requested water resources. Therefore, the project will have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project.

- e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

## Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The proposed project for a grading permit for an agricultural use and will not produce any wastewater; therefore, the project will not interfere with any wastewater treatment providers service capacity.

- f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

## Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** Implementation of the project will generate solid waste. All solid waste facilities, including landfills require solid waste facility permits to operate. In San Diego County, the County Department of Environmental Health, Local Enforcement Agency issues solid waste facility permits with concurrence from the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) under the authority of the Public Resources Code (Sections 44001-44018) and California Code of Regulations Title 27, Division 2, Subdivision 1, Chapter 4 (Section 21440et seq.). There are five, permitted active landfills in San Diego County with remaining capacity. Therefore, there is sufficient existing permitted solid waste capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs.

- g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

***Less than Significant Impact:*** Implementation of the project will generate solid waste. All solid waste facilities, including landfills require solid waste facility permits to operate. In San Diego County, the County Department of Environmental Health, Local Enforcement Agency issues solid waste facility permits with concurrence from the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) under the authority of the Public Resources Code (Sections 44001-44018) and California Code of Regulations Title 27, Division 2, Subdivision 1, Chapter 4 (Section 21440et seq.). The project will deposit all solid waste at a permitted solid waste facility and therefore, will comply with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

**XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:**

- a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                                | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                    |

Discussion/Explanation:

Per the instructions for evaluating environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory were considered in the response to each question in sections IV and V of this form. In addition to project specific impacts, this evaluation considered the projects potential for significant cumulative effects. Resources that have been evaluated as significant would be potentially impacted by the project, particularly biology. However, mitigation has been included that clearly reduces these effects to a level below significance. This mitigation includes 0.3 acre of chaparral habitat credit to be secured in a mitigation bank approved by the California Department of Fish & Game (located at the Daley Ranch Conservation Bank.) As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that, after mitigation, significant effects associated with this project would result. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

- b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☒ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

The following list of past, present and future projects were considered and evaluated as a part of this Initial Study:

PROJECT NAME	PERMIT/MAP NUMBER
Administrative Permit	AD 02-063
Tentative Parcel Map	TPM 20728

Per the instructions for evaluating environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential for adverse cumulative effects were considered in the response to each question in sections I through XVI of this form. In addition to project specific impacts, this evaluation considered the projects potential for incremental effects that are cumulatively considerable. As a result of this evaluation, there were determined to be potentially significant cumulative effects related to biology. However, mitigation has been included that clearly reduces these cumulative effects to a level below significance. This mitigation includes 0.3 acre of chaparral habitat credit to be secured in a mitigation bank approved by the California Department of Fish & Game, located at the Daley Ranch Conservation Bank. As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that, after mitigation, there are cumulative effects associated with this project. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

- c) Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☒ Less than Significant Impact
- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

In the evaluation of environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential for adverse direct or indirect impacts to human beings were considered in the response to certain questions in sections I. Aesthetics, III. Air Quality, VI. Geology and Soils, VII. Hazards



and Hazardous Materials, VIII Hydrology and Water Quality XI. Noise, XII. Population and Housing, and XV. Transportation and Traffic. As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that there are adverse effects on human beings associated with this project. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

#### **XVIII. REFERENCES USED IN THE COMPLETION OF THE INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST**

All references to Federal, State and local regulation are available on the Internet. For Federal regulation refer to <http://www4.law.cornell.edu/uscode/>. For State regulation refer to [www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov). For County regulation refer to [www.amlegal.com](http://www.amlegal.com). All other references are available upon request.

Stormwater Management Plan for Priority Projects, dated March 20, 2008., and prepared by Michael L. Benesh.

Drainage Study, dated March 20, 2008, and prepared by Michael L. Benesh.

Biological Resource Report, dated March 25, 2008, and prepared by Gretchen Cummings.

## **AESTHETICS**

CALIFORNIA STREET AND HIGHWAYS CODE [CALIFORNIA STREET AND HIGHWAYS CODE, SECTION 260-283.  
([HTTP://WWW.LEGINFO.CA.GOV/](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/))

CALIFORNIA SCENIC HIGHWAY PROGRAM, CALIFORNIA STREETS AND HIGHWAYS CODE, SECTION 260-283.  
([HTTP://WWW.DOT.CA.GOV/HQ/LANDARCH/SCENIC/SCPR.HTM](http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/landarch/scenic/scpr.htm))

County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use. The Zoning Ordinance of San Diego County. Sections 5200-5299; 5700-5799; 5900-5910, 6322-6326. (([www.co.san-diego.ca.us](http://www.co.san-diego.ca.us))

County of San Diego, Board Policy I-73: Hillside Development Policy. ([www.co.san-diego.ca.us](http://www.co.san-diego.ca.us))

County of San Diego, Board Policy I-104: Policy and Procedures for Preparation of Community Design Guidelines, Section 396.10 of the County Administrative Code and Section 5750 et seq. of the County Zoning Ordinance. ([www.co.san-diego.ca.us](http://www.co.san-diego.ca.us))

County of San Diego, General Plan, Scenic Highway Element VI and Scenic Highway Program. ([ceres.ca.gov](http://ceres.ca.gov))

COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO LIGHT POLLUTION CODE, TITLE 5, DIVISION 9 (SECTIONS 59.101-59.115 OF THE COUNTY CODE OF REGULATORY ORDINANCES) AS ADDED BY ORDINANCE NO 6900, EFFECTIVE JANUARY 18, 1985, AND AMENDED JULY 17, 1986 BY ORDINANCE NO. 7155. ([WWW.AMLEGAL.COM](http://WWW.AMLEGAL.COM))

COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO WIRELESS COMMUNICATIONS ORDINANCE [SAN DIEGO COUNTY CODE OF REGULATORY ORDINANCES. ([WWW.AMLEGAL.COM](http://WWW.AMLEGAL.COM))

DESIGN REVIEW GUIDELINES FOR THE COMMUNITIES OF SAN DIEGO COUNTY. (ALPINE, BONSALE, FALLBROOK, JULIAN, LAKESIDE, RAMONA, SPRING VALLEY, SWEETWATER, VALLEY CENTER).

Federal Communications Commission, Telecommunications Act of 1996 [Telecommunications Act of 1996, Pub. LA. No. 104-104, 110 Stat. 56 (1996). (<http://www.fcc.gov/Reports/tcom1996.txt>)

INSTITUTION OF LIGHTING ENGINEERS, GUIDANCE NOTES FOR THE REDUCTION OF LIGHT POLLUTION, WARWICKSHIRE, UK, 2000 ([HTTP://WWW.DARK-SKIES.ORG/ILE-GD-E.HTM](http://WWW.DARK-SKIES.ORG/ILE-GD-E.HTM))

INTERNATIONAL LIGHT INC., LIGHT MEASUREMENT HANDBOOK, 1997. ([WWW.INTL-LIGHT.COM](http://WWW.INTL-LIGHT.COM))

Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Lighting Research Center, National Lighting Product Information Program (NLPIP), Lighting Answers, Volume 7, Issue 2, March 2003. ([www.lrc.rpi.edu](http://www.lrc.rpi.edu))

US Census Bureau, Census 2000, Urbanized Area Outline Map, San Diego, CA.  
(<http://www.census.gov/geo/www/maps/ua2kmaps.htm>)

US Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) modified Visual Management System. ([www.blm.gov](http://www.blm.gov))

US Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Visual Impact Assessment for Highway Projects.

US Department of Transportation, National Highway System Act of 1995 [Title III, Section 304. Design Criteria for the National Highway System. (<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/legisregs/nhsdatoc.html>)

## **AGRICULTURE RESOURCES**

California Department of Conservation, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, "A Guide to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program," November 1994. ([www.consrv.ca.gov](http://www.consrv.ca.gov))

California Department of Conservation, Office of Land Conversion, "California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model Instruction Manual," 1997. ([www.consrv.ca.gov](http://www.consrv.ca.gov))

California Farmland Conservancy Program, 1996. ([www.consrv.ca.gov](http://www.consrv.ca.gov))

California Land Conservation (Williamson) Act, 1965. ([www.ceres.ca.gov](http://www.ceres.ca.gov), [www.consrv.ca.gov](http://www.consrv.ca.gov))

California Right to Farm Act, as amended 1996. ([www.qp.gov.bc.ca](http://www.qp.gov.bc.ca))

County of San Diego Agricultural Enterprises and Consumer Information Ordinance, 1994, Title 6, Division 3, Ch. 4. Sections 63.401-63.408. ([www.amlegal.com](http://www.amlegal.com))

County of San Diego, Department of Agriculture, Weights and Measures, "2002 Crop Statistics and Annual Report," 2002. ([www.sdcountry.ca.gov](http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov))

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resource Conservation Service LESA System. ([www.nrcs.usda.gov](http://www.nrcs.usda.gov), [www.swcs.org](http://www.swcs.org)).

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, SOIL SURVEY FOR THE SAN DIEGO AREA, CALIFORNIA. 1973.  
([SOILS.USDA.GOV](http://SOILS.USDA.GOV))

#### AIR QUALITY

CEQA Air Quality Analysis Guidance Handbook, South Coast Air Quality Management District, Revised November 1993.  
([www.aqmd.gov](http://www.aqmd.gov))

County of San Diego Air Pollution Control District's Rules and Regulations, updated August 2003. ([www.co.san-diego.ca.us](http://www.co.san-diego.ca.us))

Federal Clean Air Act US Code; Title 42; Chapter 85 Subchapter 1. ([www4.law.cornell.edu](http://www4.law.cornell.edu))

#### BIOLOGY

California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG). Southern California Coastal Sage Scrub Natural Community Conservation Planning Process Guidelines. CDFG and California Resources Agency, Sacramento, California. 1993. ([www.dfg.ca.gov](http://www.dfg.ca.gov))

County of San Diego, An Ordinance Amending the San Diego County Code to Establish a Process for Issuance of the Coastal Sage Scrub Habitat Loss Permits and Declaring the Urgency Thereof to Take Effect Immediately, Ordinance No. 8365. 1994, Title 8, Div 6, Ch. 1. Sections 86.101-86.105, 87.202.2. ([www.amlegal.com](http://www.amlegal.com))

County of San Diego, Biological Mitigation Ordinance, Ord. Nos. 8845, 9246, 1998 (new series). ([www.co.san-diego.ca.us](http://www.co.san-diego.ca.us))

County of San Diego, Implementing Agreement by and between United States Fish and Wildlife Service, California Department of Fish and Game and County of San Diego. County of San Diego, Multiple Species Conservation Program, 1998.

County of San Diego, Multiple Species Conservation Program, County of San Diego Subarea Plan, 1997.

Holland, R.R. Preliminary Descriptions of the Terrestrial Natural Communities of California. State of California, Resources Agency, Department of Fish and Game, Sacramento, California, 1986.

Memorandum of Understanding [Agreement Between United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CDF), San Diego County Fire Chief's Association and the Fire District's Association of San Diego County.

Stanislaus Audubon Society, Inc. v County of Stanislaus (5<sup>th</sup> Dist. 1995) 33 Cal.App.4<sup>th</sup> 144, 155-159 [39 Cal. Rptr.2d 54].  
([www.ceres.ca.gov](http://www.ceres.ca.gov))

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Environmental Laboratory. Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Wetlands Research Program Technical Report Y-87-1. 1987. (<http://www.wes.army.mil/>)

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. America's wetlands: our vital link between land and water. Office of Water, Office of Wetlands, Oceans and Watersheds. EPA843-K-95-001. 1995b. ([www.epa.gov](http://www.epa.gov))

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service. Habitat Conservation Planning Handbook. Department of Interior, Washington, D.C. 1996. ([endangered.fws.gov](http://endangered.fws.gov))

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service. Consultation Handbook: Procedures for Conducting Consultation and Conference Activities Under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act. Department of Interior, Washington, D.C. 1998. ([endangered.fws.gov](http://endangered.fws.gov))

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Environmental Assessment and Land Protection Plan for the Vernal Pools Stewardship Project. Portland, Oregon. 1997.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Vernal Pools of Southern California Recovery Plan. U.S. Department of Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, Region One, Portland, Oregon, 1998. ([ecos.fws.gov](http://ecos.fws.gov))

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Birds of conservation concern 2002. Division of Migratory. 2002. ([migratorybirds.fws.gov](http://migratorybirds.fws.gov))

#### CULTURAL RESOURCES

California Health & Safety Code. §18950-18961, State Historic Building Code. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Health & Safety Code. §5020-5029, Historical Resources. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Health & Safety Code. §7050.5, Human Remains. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, (AB 978), 2001. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Public Resources Code §5024.1, Register of Historical Resources. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Public Resources Code. §5031-5033, State Landmarks. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Public Resources Code. §5097-5097.6, Archaeological, Paleontological, and Historic Sites. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Public Resources Code. §5097.9-5097.991, Native American Heritage. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

City of San Diego. Paleontological Guidelines. (revised) August 1998.

County of San Diego, Local Register of Historical Resources (Ordinance 9493), 2002. ([www.co.san-diego.ca.us](http://www.co.san-diego.ca.us))

Demere, Thomas A., and Stephen L. Walsh. Paleontological Resources San Diego County. Department of Paleontology, San Diego Natural History Museum. 1994.

Moore, Ellen J. Fossil Mollusks of San Diego County. San Diego Society of Natural history. Occasional; Paper 15. 1968.

U.S. Code including: American Antiquities Act (16 USC §431-433) 1906. Historic Sites, Buildings, and Antiquities Act (16 USC §461-467), 1935. Reservoir Salvage Act (16 USC §469-469c) 1960. Department of Transportation Act (49 USC §303) 1966. National Historic Preservation Act (16 USC §470 et seq.) 1966. National Environmental Policy Act (42 USC §4321) 1969. Coastal Zone Management Act (16 USC §1451) 1972. National Marine Sanctuaries Act (16 USC §1431) 1972. Archaeological and Historical Preservation Act (16 USC §469-469c) 1974. Federal Land Policy and Management Act (43 USC §35) 1976. American Indian Religious Freedom Act (42 USC §1996 and 1996a) 1978. Archaeological Resources Protection Act (16 USC §470aa-mm) 1979. Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (25 USC §3001-3013) 1990. Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (23 USC §101, 109) 1991. American Battlefield Protection Act (16 USC 469k) 1996. ([www4.law.cornell.edu](http://www4.law.cornell.edu))

## GEOLOGY & SOILS

California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, California Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Special Publication 42, Revised 1997. ([www.consrv.ca.gov](http://www.consrv.ca.gov))

California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, Fault-Rupture Hazard Zones in California, Special Publication 42, revised 1997. ([www.consrv.ca.gov](http://www.consrv.ca.gov))

California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, Special Publication 117, Guidelines for Evaluating and Mitigating Seismic Hazards in California, 1997. ([www.consrv.ca.gov](http://www.consrv.ca.gov))

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances Title 6, Division 8, Chapter 3, Septic Ranks and Seepage Pits. ([www.amlegal.com](http://www.amlegal.com))

County of San Diego Department of Environmental Health, Land and Water Quality Division, February 2002. On-site Wastewater Systems (Septic Systems): Permitting Process and Design Criteria. ([www.sdcountry.ca.gov](http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov))

County of San Diego Natural Resource Inventory, Section 3, Geology.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, SOIL SURVEY FOR THE SAN DIEGO AREA, CALIFORNIA. 1973. (SOILS.USDA.GOV)

## HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

American Planning Association, Zoning News, "Saving Homes from Wildfires: Regulating the Home Ignition Zone," May 2001.

California Building Code (CBC), Seismic Requirements, Chapter 16 Section 162. ([www.buildersbook.com](http://www.buildersbook.com))

California Education Code, Section 17215 and 81033. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

CALIFORNIA GOVERNMENT CODE. § 8585-8589, EMERGENCY SERVICES ACT. ([WWW.LEGINFO.CA.GOV](http://WWW.LEGINFO.CA.GOV))

California Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List. April 1998. ([www.dtsc.ca.gov](http://www.dtsc.ca.gov))

California Health & Safety Code Chapter 6.95 and §25117 and §25316. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Health & Safety Code § 2000-2067. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Health & Safety Code. §17922.2. Hazardous Buildings. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Public Utilities Code, SDCRAA. Public Utilities Code, Division 17, Sections 170000-170084. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Resources Agency, "OES Dam Failure Inundation Mapping and Emergency Procedures Program", 1996. ([ceres.ca.gov](http://ceres.ca.gov))

County of San Diego, Consolidated Fire Code Health and Safety Code §13869.7, including Ordinances of the 17 Fire Protection Districts as Ratified by the San Diego County Board of Supervisors, First Edition, October 17, 2001 and Amendments to the Fire Code portion of the State Building Standards Code, 1998 Edition.

County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health Community Health Division Vector Surveillance and Control. Annual Report for Calendar Year 2002. March 2003. ([www.sdcountry.ca.gov](http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov))

County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Division. California Accidental Release Prevention Program (CalARP) Guidelines. (<http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov>, [www.oes.ca.gov](http://www.oes.ca.gov))

County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Division. Hazardous Materials Business Plan Guidelines. ([www.sdcounty.ca.gov](http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov))

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 3, Div 5, CH. 3, Section 35.39100.030, Wildland/Urban Interface Ordinance, Ord. No.9111, 2000. ([www.amlegal.com](http://www.amlegal.com))

Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act as amended October 30, 2000, US Code, Title 42, Chapter 68, 5121, et seq. ([www4.law.cornell.edu](http://www4.law.cornell.edu))

**Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization Operational Area Emergency Plan, March 2000.**

**Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization Operational Area Energy Shortage Response Plan, June 1995.**

Uniform Building Code. ([www.buildersbook.com](http://www.buildersbook.com))

Uniform Fire Code 1997 edition published by the Western Fire Chiefs Association and the International Conference of Building Officials, and the National Fire Protection Association Standards 13 &13-D, 1996 Edition, and 13-R, 1996 Edition. ([www.buildersbook.com](http://www.buildersbook.com))

#### **HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY**

American Planning Association, Planning Advisory Service Report Number 476 Non-point Source Pollution: A Handbook for Local Government

California Department of Water Resources, California Water Plan Update. Sacramento: Dept. of Water Resources State of California. 1998. ([rubicon.water.ca.gov](http://rubicon.water.ca.gov))

California Department of Water Resources, California's Groundwater Update 2003 Bulletin 118, April 2003. ([www.groundwater.water.ca.gov](http://www.groundwater.water.ca.gov))

California Department of Water Resources, Water Facts, No. 8, August 2000. ([www.dpla2.water.ca.gov](http://www.dpla2.water.ca.gov))

**California Disaster Assistance Act. Government Code, § 8680-8692. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))**

**California State Water Resources Control Board, NPDES General Permit Nos. CAS000001 INDUSTRIAL ACTIVITIES (97-03-DWQ) and CAS000002 Construction Activities (No. 99-08-DWQ) ([www.swrcb.ca.gov](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov))**

**California Storm Water Quality Association, California Storm Water Best Management Practice Handbooks, 2003.**

California Water Code, Sections 10754, 13282, and 60000 et seq. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

Colorado River Basin Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region 7, Water Quality Control Plan. ([www.swrcb.ca.gov](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov))

**County of San Diego Regulatory Ordinance, Title 8, Division 7, Grading Ordinance. Grading, Clearing and Watercourses. ([www.amlegal.com](http://www.amlegal.com))**

County of San Diego, Groundwater Ordinance. #7994. ([www.sdcounty.ca.gov](http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov), <http://www.amlegal.com/>.)

County of San Diego, Project Clean Water Strategic Plan, 2002. ([www.projectcleanwater.org](http://www.projectcleanwater.org))

County of San Diego, Watershed Protection, Storm Water Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance, Ordinance Nos. 9424 and 9426. Chapter 8, Division 7, Title 6 of the San Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances and amendments. ([www.amlegal.com](http://www.amlegal.com))

County of San Diego. Board of Supervisors Policy I-68. Diego Proposed Projects in Flood Plains with Defined Floodways. ([www.co.san-diego.ca.us](http://www.co.san-diego.ca.us))

Federal Water Pollution Control Act (Clean Water Act), 1972, Title 33, Ch.26, Sub-Ch.1. ([www4.law.cornell.edu](http://www4.law.cornell.edu))

Freeze, Allan and Cherry, John A., Groundwater, Prentice-Hall, Inc. New Jersey, 1979.

Heath, Ralph C., Basic Ground-Water Hydrology, United States Geological Survey Water-Supply Paper; 2220, 1991.

National Flood Insurance Act of 1968. ([www.fema.gov](http://www.fema.gov))

National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1994. ([www.fema.gov](http://www.fema.gov))

Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, California Water Code Division 7. Water Quality. ([ceres.ca.gov](http://ceres.ca.gov))

San Diego Association of Governments, Water Quality Element, Regional Growth Management Strategy, 1997. ([www.sandag.org](http://www.sandag.org))

San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board, NPDES Permit No. CAS0108758. ([www.swrcb.ca.gov](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov))

San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board, Water Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Basin. ([www.swrcb.ca.gov](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov))

California Department of Conservation Division of Mines and Geology, Open File Report 96-04, Update of Mineral Land

Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego County Production Consumption Region, 1996.

([www.consrv.ca.gov](http://www.consrv.ca.gov))

California Environmental Quality Act, CEQA Guidelines, 2003. ([ceres.ca.gov](http://ceres.ca.gov))

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT, PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE 21000-21178; CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS, GUIDELINES FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF CEQA, APPENDIX G, TITLE 14, CHAPTER 3, §15000-15387. ([WWW.LEGINFO.CA.GOV](http://WWW.LEGINFO.CA.GOV))

California General Plan Glossary of Terms, 2001. ([ceres.ca.gov](http://ceres.ca.gov))

California State Mining and Geology Board, SP 51, California Surface Mining and Reclamation Policies and Procedures, January 2000. ([www.consrv.ca.gov](http://www.consrv.ca.gov))

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 8, Zoning and Land Use Regulations. ([www.amlegal.com](http://www.amlegal.com))

County of San Diego, Board of Supervisors Policy I-84: Project Facility. ([www.sdcountry.ca.gov](http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov))

County of San Diego, Board Policy I-38, as amended 1989. ([www.sdcountry.ca.gov](http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov))

County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use. The Zoning Ordinance of San Diego County. ([www.co.san-diego.ca.us](http://www.co.san-diego.ca.us))

County of San Diego, General Plan as adopted and amended from September 29, 1971 to April 5, 2000. ([ceres.ca.gov](http://ceres.ca.gov))

County of San Diego. Resource Protection Ordinance, compilation of Ord.Nos. 7968, 7739, 7685 and 7631. 1991.

Design Review Guidelines for the Communities of San Diego County.

Guide to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) by Michael H. Remy, Tina A. Thomas, James G. Moore, and Whitman F. Manley, Point Arena, CA: Solano Press Books, 1999. ([ceres.ca.gov](http://ceres.ca.gov))

#### MINERAL RESOURCES

National Environmental Policy Act, Title 42, 36.401 et. seq. 1969. ([www4.law.cornell.edu](http://www4.law.cornell.edu))

Subdivision Map Act, 2003. ([ceres.ca.gov](http://ceres.ca.gov))

U.S. Geologic Survey, Causey, J. Douglas, 1998, MAS/MILS Mineral Location Database.

U.S. Geologic Survey, Frank, David G., 1999, (MRDS) Mineral Resource Data System.

#### NOISE

CALIFORNIA STATE BUILDING CODE, PART 2, TITLE 24, CCR, APPENDIX CHAPTER 3, SOUND TRANSMISSION CONTROL, 1988. . ([WWW.BUILDERSBOOK.COM](http://WWW.BUILDERSBOOK.COM))

COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO CODE OF REGULATORY ORDINANCES, TITLE 3, DIV 6, CHAPTER 4, NOISE ABATEMENT AND CONTROL, EFFECTIVE FEBRUARY 4, 1982. ([WWW.AMLEGAL.COM](http://WWW.AMLEGAL.COM))

COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO GENERAL PLAN, PART VIII, NOISE ELEMENT, EFFECTIVE DECEMBER 17, 1980. ([CERES.CA.GOV](http://CERES.CA.GOV))

FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION, FEDERAL AVIATION REGULATIONS, PART 150 AIRPORT NOISE COMPATIBILITY PLANNING (REVISED JANUARY 18, 1985). ([HTTP://WWW.ACCESS.GPO.GOV/](http://WWW.ACCESS.GPO.GOV/))

HARRIS MILLER MILLER AND HANSON INC., *TRANSIT NOISE AND VIBRATION IMPACT ASSESSMENT*, APRIL 1995. ([HTTP://NTL.BTS.GOV/DATA/RAIL05/RAIL05.HTML](http://NTL.BTS.GOV/DATA/RAIL05/RAIL05.HTML))

INTERNATIONAL STANDARD ORGANIZATION (ISO), ISO 362; ISO 1996 1-3; ISO 3095; AND ISO 3740-3747. ([WWW.ISO.CH](http://WWW.ISO.CH))

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION, OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING, NOISE AND AIR QUALITY BRANCH. "HIGHWAY TRAFFIC NOISE ANALYSIS AND ABATEMENT POLICY AND GUIDANCE," WASHINGTON, D.C., JUNE 1995. ([HTTP://WWW.FHWA.DOT.GOV/](http://WWW.FHWA.DOT.GOV/))

Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, 42 USC 5309, Title 42--The Public Health And Welfare, Chapter 69--Community Development, United States Congress, August 22, 1974. ([www4.law.cornell.edu](http://www4.law.cornell.edu))

NATIONAL HOUSING ACT (CRANSTON-GONZALES), TITLE 12, CH. 13. ([WWW4.LAW.CORNELL.EDU](http://WWW4.LAW.CORNELL.EDU))

SAN DIEGO ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS POPULATION AND HOUSING ESTIMATES, NOVEMBER 2000.  
([WWW.SANDAG.ORG](http://WWW.SANDAG.ORG))

US CENSUS BUREAU, CENSUS 2000. ([HTTP://WWW.CENSUS.GOV/](http://WWW.CENSUS.GOV/))

#### RECREATION

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 8, Division 10, Chapter PLDO, §810.101 et seq. Park Lands Dedication Ordinance. ([www.amlegal.com](http://www.amlegal.com))

#### TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

California Aeronautics Act, Public Utilities Code, Section 21001 et seq. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Department of Transportation, Division of Aeronautics, California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook, January 2002.

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAM ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERING – NOISE, AIR QUALITY, AND HAZARDOUS WASTE MANAGEMENT OFFICE. "TRAFFIC NOISE ANALYSIS PROTOCOL FOR NEW HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION AND RECONSTRUCTION PROJECTS," OCTOBER 1998. ([WWW.DOT.CA.GOV](http://WWW.DOT.CA.GOV))

California Public Utilities Code, SDCRAA. Public Utilities Code, Division 17, Sections 170000-170084. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

CALIFORNIA STREET AND HIGHWAYS CODE. CALIFORNIA STREET AND HIGHWAYS CODE, SECTION 260-283.  
([WWW.LEGINFO.CA.GOV](http://WWW.LEGINFO.CA.GOV))

COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO, ALTERNATIVE FEE SCHEDULES WITH PASS-BY TRIPS ADDENDUM TO TRANSPORTATION IMPACT FEE REPORTS, MARCH 2005.  
([HTTP://WWW.SDCOUNTY.CA.GOV/DPW/LAND/PDF/TRANSIMPACTFEE/ATTACHA.PDF](http://WWW.SDCOUNTY.CA.GOV/DPW/LAND/PDF/TRANSIMPACTFEE/ATTACHA.PDF))

COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO TRANSPORTATION IMPACT FEE REPORT. JANUARY 2005.  
([HTTP://WWW.SDCOUNTY.CA.GOV/DPW/PERMITS-FORMS/MANUALS.HTML](http://WWW.SDCOUNTY.CA.GOV/DPW/PERMITS-FORMS/MANUALS.HTML))

FALLBROOK & RAMONA TRANSPORTATION IMPACT FEE REPORT, COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO, JANUARY 2005.  
([HTTP://WWW.SDCOUNTY.CA.GOV/DPW/PERMITS-FORMS/MANUALS.HTML](http://WWW.SDCOUNTY.CA.GOV/DPW/PERMITS-FORMS/MANUALS.HTML))

OFFICE OF PLANNING, FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION, TRANSIT NOISE AND VIBRATION IMPACT ASSESSMENT, FINAL REPORT, APRIL 1995.

San Diego Association of Governments, 2020 Regional Transportation Plan. Prepared by the San Diego Association of Governments. ([www.sandag.org](http://www.sandag.org))

San Diego Association of Governments, Comprehensive Land Use Plan for Borrego Valley Airport (1986), Brown Field (1995), Fallbrook Community Airpark (1991), Gillespie Field (1989), McClellan-Palomar Airport (1994). ([www.sandag.org](http://www.sandag.org))

*US Code of Federal Regulations, Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR), Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace, Title 14, Chapter 1, Part 77.* ([www.gpoaccess.gov](http://www.gpoaccess.gov))

#### UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS

California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 14. Natural Resources Division, CIWMB Division 7; and Title 27, Environmental Protection Division 2, Solid Waste. ([ccr.oal.ca.gov](http://ccr.oal.ca.gov))

California Integrated Waste Management Act. Public Resources Code, Division 30, Waste Management, Sections 40000-41956.  
([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

County of San Diego, Board of Supervisors Policy I-78: Small Wastewater. ([www.sdcounty.ca.gov](http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov))

**Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization Annex T Emergency Water Contingencies, October 1992.**  
([www.co.san-diego.ca.us](http://www.co.san-diego.ca.us))

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resource Conservation Service LESA System.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, SOIL SURVEY FOR THE SAN DIEGO AREA, CALIFORNIA. 1973.

US CENSUS BUREAU, CENSUS 2000.

*US Code of Federal Regulations, Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR), Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace, Title 14, Chapter 1, Part 77.*

US Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) modified Visual Management System.

Elder L-15206

- 7 -

MAY 1, 2008

US Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Visual Impact Assessment for Highway Projects.